Classical Philology

CONTRACTION IN THE CASE FORMS OF THE LATIN *i̯o-* AND *i̯ā- stems*, AND OF *deus*, *is*, AND *idem*

A DISSERTATION

BY

EDGAR HOWARD STURTEVANT

SOMETIME FELLOW OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

CONTRACTION IN THE CASE FORMS OF THE LATIN i̯o- AND i̯ā- STEMS, AND OF *deus*, *is*, AND *idem*

I

The object of this paper is the investigation of some ques- tions relating to the nominative plural and dative-ablative plural of *deus* and to the nominative plural masculine and dative-ablative plural of *is* and *idem*. But as we shall have frequent occasion to refer to the history of the i̯o- and i̯ā-stems, we shall first consider briefly the contracted genitives singular like *fili* and the contracted plural cases like *fili* and *filis*.

The history of the genitive in -*i* has been treated very often.[1] The results of the discussion may be summarized as follows: the form with -*i* was the only one in use in early Latin for substantives. Adjectives, however, ended in -*ii*. Varro, and after him the whole school of the analogists, prescribed the ending -*ii* because the genitive must not have fewer syllables than the nominative. The effect of this theory is seen already in Propertius, and in Vergil, if one accepts Aen. III. 702 with its genitive *fluvii*. Ovid and most of the later poets use -*ii* prevailingly, but Manilius, Persius, and Martial use -*i* with a very few exceptions. The use of -*ii* on inscriptions dates from the end of Augustus's reign, but -*i* is the prevalent form throughout the empire. Proper names are especially conservative in the retention of -*i*.

The short forms of the nominative and dative-ablative plural have attracted less attention.

---

[1] Notably by Bentley, note on Terence, Andr. II 1, 20; Sverdsjö, Vindiciae praecepti Bentleiani de genitivo substantivorum in -ius et -ium desinentium, Riga and Dorpat 1832; Lachmann, note on Lucretius V 1006; Neue, Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache I³ 134-154, 11³ 44 f.; Ritschl, Abhandlungen der bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften I Classe X 338 ff.=Opuscula IV 623 ff.; Mommsen, Hermes I 461 ff.; Brambach, Die Neugestaltung der lateinischen Orthographie 188 ff., 328 ff.; Corssen, Über Aussprache, Vokalismus and Betonung der lateinischen Sprache II² 696 ff.; Weissbrodt, Philologus XLIII 450 ff.

The usage of the early poets has been pretty well determined. Ritschl, Prolegomena to Plautus, Trinummus, p. CLXI (1848), observed that, although *filio, filios, filii, filius* and the like often appeared as dissyllables in Plautus's anapaests, they were never so scanned in the more common meters.[1] He thought that *gratis* and *ingratis*, later the regular forms, did not occur in Plautus. Corssen, Aussprache II[2] 698 ff. (1870), held that Plautus never used the short forms. Ussing, on the other hand, Prolegomena to Plautus 212 (1875), thought that even *gratis* must be read at Capt. 406 (= 408 Ritschl) and perhaps *ingratis* at Amph. 162 (= 164 Ritschl). Three years later, in his edition of the Captivi, Ussing wrote *gratiis.* Klotz, Altrömische Metrik 60 (1890), pointed out that the iambic[2] shortening law would do away with the necessity for scanning *filio, filios, filii, filiis*, etc., as dissyllables in Plautus; for example, Bacch. 1204:

Filiī vos expectant intus. Quam quidem actutum emoriamur,

instead of:

Filī vos expectant——

Stolz, however, Historische Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache 220 (1894), wrote: "Auch für den Nominativ und Dativ-Ablativ des Plural ist die Ursprünglichkeit der Ausgänge -*i* und -*is* zum mindesten nicht unwahrscheinlich." In Müller's Handbuch der klassischen Alterthumswissenschaft II[3] 2, 120 (1900), he expresses a similar view: "Bei den *ĭo-* Stämmen bevorzugte die ältere Sprache die kontrahierten Formen, zum Beispiel *filei fili* (und *filiei*) . . ."

Lachmann, note on Lucretius IV 680 (1850), held that the poets always used the nominative in -*ii*. But in his note on V 85 he gave a number of examples of the contracted dative-ablative plural ranging from Plautus to Martial. Neue, Formenlehre I[3] 159 f., admitted the contraction in the nominative plural also.[3] Lindsay, The Latin Language (1894),

---

[1] C. F. W. Müller, Plautinische Prosodie 464 (1869), repeats Ritschl's remark, and discusses several passages that apparently show the short form.

[2] The view of the applicability of the iambic law assumed in this paper is, in the main, that of Klotz, Altrömische Metrik 53 to 97, with the modification urged by Manning, Harvard Studies in Classical Philology IX 87 ff.

[3] He was followed by Corssen, Aussprache II[2] 698 ff., and by Bücheler-Windekilde, Grundriss der lateinischen Declination 88, 129.

treated the nominative and the dative-ablative differently. Of the latter he said (p. 403): "We find *-iis* contracted in the course of time into *-is;* thus *gratiis* (always with *-iis* . . . in Plautus and Terence . . .) became *gratis* in classical Latin." On p. 398 we read: "A nominative plural of an *io-* stem with *-is* occurs on an inscription of the first century A. D. (Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum I 1541 b), *filis*. It is impossible to say whether *filei* (I 1272), *feilei* (I 1284, compare *socei*, I 1041) is meant for this form (compare *Clodi* for *Clodis* nominative singular), or is a misspelling of *filiei* (I 1275) or a contraction of it (like *gratis* for older *gratiis*)." Brambach, Neugestaltung 196 (1868), pointed out that the Roman grammarians barely méntion the contracted forms of the plural cases. This fact he considered proof that the scholastic theory never adopted them. Corssen, Aussprache II² 698 ff., noted that the short form occurred on state inscriptions. Weissbrodt, Philologus XLIII 453 f. (1884), observed that on imperial inscriptions *fili* and *filis* were far more common than *filii* and *filiis*. Proper names, on the other hand, usually showed *-ii* and *-iis*.

The most economical way of bringing order into this chaos will be to state the results of the discussion along with whatever additions I have to make.

As already stated, Klotz has finally banished *fili*, *filis* and the like from Plautus and Terence. If the contracted forms had been in use at that period we should almost certainly find some of them among the exceedingly frequent *io-* and *iā-* stems of early comedy. In the Asin., Bacch., Capt. and Merc., I find the following forms where the meter will not permit contraction: *The early period.—Evidence of the literature.*

alii – 2	*exitiis*
aliis – 4	*fallaciis* – 3
astutiis	*filii*
bracchiis	*filiis* – 2
comoediis	*gaudiis*
custodiis	*gratiis* – 5
deliciis	*ingeniis*
ditiis	*ingratiis*
Ephesiis	*insidiis*
eximiis	*laniis*

31

mendaciis	*patriciis*
miseriis	*perfidiis*
negotiis	*periuriis* – 2
noxiis (Merc. 983 b?)	*piscariis*
obnoxii	*Samiis*
offuciis	*saviis*
olearii	*sycophantiis*

In the same plays I find fourteen places where the meter would admit either the contracted or the uncontracted form.

This is exactly the state of affairs that other considerations would lead one to expect in Plautus. In his time the diphthongs *oi*, *ai* of the nominative and dative-ablative plural had only reached the stage $\bar{e}$ (compare Brugmann, Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen I² 184; 227 f.) and there is no reason in the nature of the case why the combination $i\bar{e}$ should contract. But when, about the year 600 a. u. c. (see Solmsen, Indogermanische Forschungen IV 244), the change of $\bar{e}$ to $\bar{\imath}$ had brought two like vowels together, contraction was almost inevitable (Stolz, Müller's Handbuch II³ 2, 49 f., has collected a large number of examples). Accordingly the following line of Turpilius (162 Ribbeck, quoted by Nonius, 306, 2) shows just the form that we should expect early in the seventh century a. u. c.:

Detégere, despoliáre opplereque ádeo fama ac *flágitis*.[1]

Hieronymus, Interpretatio Chronicorum Eusebi 1914 = 651 a. u. c. says, "Turpilius comicus senex admodum Sinuessae moritur." Ritschl, Parerga 188, thinks that he stopped writing about 600 a. u. c., but there is nothing against the supposition that his activity lasted a few years into the new century.

Evidence of the inscriptions. So far as I know, the earliest instances of the short forms on inscriptions are *controversis*, *flovi*, *Ianuaris*, *Veituris*, *Vituris* of the Sententia Minuciorum (a. u. c. 637). The

---

[1] C. F. W. Müller, Plautinische Prosodie 464, suggested the emendation *famae ac flagiti*, but Ribbeck, Comicorum Romanorum Fragmenta,² p. XXXIX, has answered the syntactical objection to the manuscript reading. Cf. also F. Leo, Plautinische Forschungen 327.

following table includes all instances of our cases of the *ị̌o-*
and *ị̌ā-* stems on the inscriptions of the Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum Volume I which fall before the year 650
a. u. c.:

ANNO URBIS CONDITAE	CORPUS I		
494[1]	195	*socieis*	
sixth century	42	*Atilies*	
608	542	*alieis*	
637	199	*controversieis*	*controversis*
			flovi
			Ianuaris
		Minucieis	
	.	*Vituries* (twice)	*Veituris*
			Vituris
643	200	*aedificieis*	
		moinicipieis	
		stipendiarieis (twice)	
		vieis	
		viasieis	
first half of the seventh century	823		*Iuni[s]*

The spellings *-iei*, *-ieis* remained the usual ones up to the
end of the republic, although the shorter forms were used
occasionally. The following list with the one just given
embraces all the shorter forms that appear on the numbered
inscriptions of Corpus I:

coloneis—206 (three times)—a. u. c. 709.
filei—1272—"littᵉris bonis et antiquis."
feilei—1284.
filis (nominative)—1541 b—first century A.D.
lani—1131.
librarei—206—a. u. c. 709.
oficeis—1050.
socei—1041.

---

[1] Wölfflin, Sitzungsberichte der bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften,
March 1890, argued that the inscription on the existing Columna Rostrata is a copy
of the one on the stone set up by Duillus. He succeeds, I think, in making his theory
probable. But the presence of such modernized spellings as *praesente[d]*, *praeda, aes,
praedad, poenicas, claseis, naveis*, however they may be explained, shows that we can
place no reliance upon the spelling of the stone as we have it.

The spelling *iei* after 600 is to be regarded as a bit of orthographical conservatism rather than an exact representation of contemporary speech. We have seen that the pronunciation *-ī*, *-īs* is what we should expect, and that early in the seventh century it had become common enough to find a place in literature. We have also direct evidence that the combination *iei* might stand for a single syllable. The epitaph of Gnaeus Cornelius Scipio Hispanus (praetor a. u. c. 615), Corpus VI 1293 = I 38, contains the hexameter line:

Virtutes generis *mieis* moribus accumulavi.

We have also *lumphieis* Corpus I 1238 = X 6797, from the late years of the republic; *sacrieis* Corpus X 5055, not earlier than 732 a. u. c.; *suieis* Corpus VI 15700; IX 4666; and *meritieis* Corpus VI 19419 (compare Ritschl, Priscae Latinitatis Monumenta Epigraphica, p. 69). I shall return to this matter later on.

A re-formation, however, was possible at any time, and in the literary speech the pronunciation *-ĭī*, *-ĭīs* was actually introduced as early as the time of Lucretius. He used the contracted form only in the words *gratis* and *ingratis* (Lachmann, note on Lucretius V 85), which permanently escaped re-formation on account of their use as adverbs and their consequent separation from the system. Aside from them there are only a few certain instances of contraction in the poets.

Propertius VI 34 Müller (pentameter):
Et, qui nunc nulli, maxima turba *Gabi.*
Compare Lachmann, note on Lucretius IV 680.
Vergil, Aen. V 269:
Puniceis ibant evincti tempora *taenis.*
Vergil, Aen. VII 631:
Ardea *Crustumerique* et turrigerae Antemnae
Compare Lachmann, note on Lucretius IV 680.
Seneca, Phoen. 625 L. (iambic):
Regna cum scelere omnibus
Sunt *exilis* graviora. Nunc belli mala
Propone.
Seneca, Med. 743 (trochaic):
Supplicis, animae, remissis currite ad thalamos novos.

Seneca, Med. 1015 (iambic):

Moramque saltem *supplicis* dona meis.

Martial I 117, 17 Gilbert (hendecasyllables):

Deprimo dabit alterove nido

Rasum pumice purpuraque cultum

Denaris tibi quinque Martialem.

Martial IX 100, 1 (elegiac):

Denaris tribus invitas et mane togatum

Observare iubes atria, Basse tua.

Martial IX 100, 6 (pentameter):

Denaris tamen hanc non emo, Basse, tribus.

Lucian Müller, de Re Metrica[2] 301, says that *Vipsanis* at Martial IV 18, 1 comes from *Vipsanus*, and compares *Vipsanas* (or *Vipsaniąs?*) at I 108, 3, which also refers to the porch of Marcus *Vipsanius* Agrippa. The nomen *Vipsanus* occurs Corpus III 3031; 3084; V 1008. But such trifling with the name of a prominent man as Müller's theory involves, seems strange, to say the least.

Lachmann, note on Lucretius IV 680, approves Bentley's insertion of -*que* at Manilius, I 787—Certantes*que* Deci votis. There is no sufficient reason for rejecting the manuscript reading: Certantes Deciivotis. Lucian Müller, ibid. p. 303, shows that we may read *cōnŭbĭīs* in the dactylic poets. Ribbeck, however, retains *cōnŭbīs* at Vergil, Aen. III 136 and Culex 299. The phrase *in somnis* occurs frequently in the dactylic poets meaning either "during sleep" or "in a dream" (for example Vergil, Aen. I 353; II 270; III 151; IV 353; 466). The latter alternative is certainly the more natural. But at Ennius, Ann. 225 Müller, contraction is, as we have seen, impossible, and the word must therefore be taken from *somnus*. Other cases, also, of *somnus* are used where the idea of dreams seems to us more prominent than that of sleep. *Lavinis*, Propertius III 32, 64 Müller, is probably from *Lavinus* (attested by Vergil, Aen. I 2), the adjective to *Lavinum*, Juvenal XII 71 (see L. Müller, ibid. p. 300).

Further evidence that the contracted forms were in good use in the best period is furnished by state inscriptions.

The Acta Ludorum Saecularium of 737, Ephemeris Epigraphica VIII p. 225 ff., contain *Milicheis* and *Ilithyis*. The Decree of the Municipal Senate of Pisae in honor of

Evidence of the inscriptions.

35

Gaius Caesar, Corpus XI 1421, has *ali* and *spoleis*. The Monumentum Ancyranum shows *auspicis, provincis* (twice), *municipis, stipendis,* beside *iudiciis, consiliis, manibiis* (four times), *municipiis, alii.* The Edict of Claudius, Corpus V 5050, has *alis, Martis* and *controversis.* The Address of Claudius, Corpus XIII 1668, has *reliquis* and *Gallis.* The Leges Malacitana et Salpensana, Corpus II 1963, 1964, show *alis, comitis* (twice), *praedis* (twice) and *suffragis,* beside *alii* (twice), *socii, comitiis* (three times) and *curiis.* The Lex Coloniae Genetivae, Ephemeris Epigraphica II 105 f. and III 87 f., has *fluvi, aedificis* and *comitis* (twice), but also *auspiciis* and *sacrificiis.*

To get a proportional view of the usage of the imperial inscriptions I have read Corpus VI 1—30681. As the common word *filius* shows the short forms very much more often than other words, I treat it separately. The personal names must also be kept by themselves. The adverb *gratis,* which occurs four times, is omitted from the statistics. Owing to the impossibility of dating a majority of the inscriptions included in the count, I group together all inscriptions that cannot be shown to be earlier than Caesar's death or later than 300 A.D. To supply more exact chronological data, I give statistics from several of the longer inscriptions.[1] The table includes a few instances of *ei* in the *i* columns, and of *iei* in the *ii* columns.

		Filii	*fili*	*filiis*	*filis*
Corpus VI	{ B.C. 44–A.D. 300	21	75	57	197
	{ after 300	4			
Other inscrip-tions	{ second century		1		
	{ third century				3

Personal Names

		-ii	*-i*	*-iis*	*-is*
Corpus VI	{ B.C. 44–A.D. 300	68	10	19	13
	{ after 300			1	
Corpus XI	1147 (Trajan)				64

[1] Besides those cited above, these are: the Additamenta ad Acta Fratrum Arvalium, Eph. Ep. VIII 316-340; the Military Diplomas, Corpus III pp. 843 ff., Eph. Ep. II pp 454 ff., IV pp. 181 ff., 495 ff., V pp. 92 ff., 610 ff., 652 ff.; Corpus X 1401; the Lex Metalli Vipascensis, Eph. Ep. III pp. 165 f.; Corpus IX 2438; the Obligatio Praediorum of Trajan, Corpus XI 1147; the Lex Manciana, L'Année Epigraphique 1897 pp. 13-19; Corpus XI 3614; VIII 2532; XIV- 2112; V 532; the Aes Italicense, Eph. Ep. VII 385 Tab. A; Corpus VIII 212; the Acta Ludorum Saecularium of A.D. 204, Eph. Ep. VIII pp. 274 ff.

Other Words

		-ii	-i	-iis	-is
Corpus VI	B.C. 44–A.D. 300	6	24	61	87
	after 300			32	1
Other inscriptions	first century	4	3	29	33
	second century		1	13	23
	third century			10	13

The spellings *fili* and *filis* are a little more than three times as frequent as the longer forms.[1]   In personal names the nominative in *-ii* is nearly ten times as frequent as that in *-i*.   Weissbrodt, Philologus XLIII 454 f., shows that this spelling was used for the sake of distinguishing the nominative plural from the genitive singular which in these words generally ended in a single *-i*.   The dative-ablative plural shows *-iis* a little more frequently than *-is* (the sixty-four instances of *-is* in the Obligatio Praediorum of Trajan certainly do not represent the common usage).   Other words show the short forms a little more frequently than the long ones up to about the end of the third century.   After that date the long forms are almost the only ones in use.

We noticed above, p. 8, that the spelling *iei* sometimes stood for the sound *ī*.   After the writing *i* had been substituted for *ei*, the combination *ii* was likewise used for the sound of *ī*.   It is not necessary to suppose a mechanical substitution of *ii* for *iei* (=*ī*), after the analogy of the change to *i* from *ei* (=*ī*).   We have seen that the pronunciations *ī* and *ĭĭ* were both in use from the time of Lucretius on.   Both spellings, therefore, must have existed side by side, and many people would read *ī* when *ii* was written.   The same persons would then be likely to write *ii* when they meant *ī*.   Accordingly we find the writing *ii* for *ī* in the following lines from metrical inscriptions (hexameter):

The spelling ii for the sound ī in the io- stems.

Bücheler, Carmina Epigraphica 709 = Corpus V 6728:
Liliis ceu vernantibus artus conservans ab alvo.

---

[1] Cf. Ziegel, De is et hic pronominibus, p. 40: "In Pentateuchi palimps. fragmento Monacensi -*ii* et -*iis* in vocum exitu raro illo modo contrahuntur.   Excipiendae autem *fili* et *filis* plurales formae quae, nisi perpaucis locis . . . nusquam duplicem *i* litteram exhibent."

The line contains an extra foot, but that fact will not help us to get *liliis* into dactylic verse.

Bücheler 716 = Corpus XII 1045:
Iura *sacerdotii* servans nomenque iugalis.
Bücheler 787 line 51 = De Rossi, Inscriptiones Christianae Urbis Romae II, 83, 26 and 85, 31 a:
Per patris ac *filii* nomen cui credimus omnes.

In the case of other words.   When the use of *ii* for *ī* had once become established the spelling spread to words where it had no historical justification. Examples on inscriptions have been collected by Ritschl, Priscae Latinitatis Monumenta Epigraphica, p. 69; Garrucci, Sylloge, p. 31; and Weissbrodt, Braunsberger Lektionskatalog für den Wintersemester, 1883-84, p. 22, and Philologus XLIII 449 f.   Only the first and last named works are accessible to me.   I give their citations with a few of my own:

amiciis	Corpus VI 11464
anniis	VI 4594, 26984 (*aniis*)
auditorii	VI 1678
bigiis	X 7295
collegiis (=*collegīs*)	VI 230
coniugii (dative)	VI 5439; X 582
defunctiis	V 4682
diivius	IX 3718
divii (genitive)	VI 9005
fiiliae	VI 11590
Honoratianii	VI 1722
honorii (dative)	VI 1682
ingenuiis	I 1492
Iisidi	IX 4772
libertii (genitive)	VI 6381
libertiis	V 7623; VI 9138
matrii	VI 19528
merentii	VI 16927
ministrii (nominative plural)	IX 3657
nuliis (=*nūllīs*)	VI 10097
opii (dative)	Fasti Vallensis 25
piissimiis	VI 6632
posteriis	VI 19878; X 2039
publiciis	VI 1892

quii (nominative plural)	Bullettino 1856 p. 157
sacrii	VI 1727
sanctissimiis	VI 629
suiis	II 3477; V 402; VI 6482; 9138; 13498 (twice); 14435; 19310; 19311; 19878; 27002; IX 2303; Bullettino 1856 p. 257
tabuliis	VI 3970
uxorii	III 5065; IX 1783

Ziegel, De is et hic pronominibus, p. 39, notes the writing *ii* for *ī* (and *ĭ*) in carefully written sixth and seventh century manuscripts.

Like all the other signs of a long vowel, this also was occasionally used for a short one. So we have:

maniibus	Corpus VI 13177
siibi	VI 28674
Suriis (cognomen, feminine nominative)	VI 5019
Valeriius	VI 28090
viiro	VI 29046

On the other hand we find *inferis* written for *inferiis* at Bücheler 1050 = Corpus VI 12307 (elegiac):

> Debuit hoc natus nobis praestare duobus,
> > Ut cineres patrios dederat *inferis*.

Compare Henzen and Bücheler ad loc.

We cannot, therefore, regard the spelling with *i* or *ii* as an exact index of pronunciation. But while the spelling *ii* for *ī* may have been fairly common, the use of *i* for *iī* was probably extremely rare. Hence the usual pronunciation of our words during the first three centuries of the Christian era was *alī*, *alīs*, etc.

The metrical inscriptions, however, seem to follow the poets. I find only the following sure cases of contraction in Bücheler:

Antoni 1218 = Corpus VI 12009
filis 533 = Corpus VI 13735; 552 = Corpus XI 3276

geneis 934 = Notizie degli scavi 1883, p. 52

gratis 1247 = Corpus VI 7193; 1414 = De Rossi Inscriptiones Christianae II 106, 49

liliis (scanned *lĭlīs*) 709 = Corpus V 6728 (quoted above).

Summary.   In the time of Plautus and Terence the nominative plural of *i̯o-* stems ended in -*ię̄* (written -*iei* or -*ie*) and the dative-ablative plural of *i̯o-* and *i̯ā-* stems ended in -*ię̄s* (written -*ieis* or -*ies*).   About 600 a. u. c. *ę̄* became -*ī* and -*ĭī*, -*ĭīs* contracted to -*ī*, -*īs*.   The spelling -*iei*, -*ieis*, however, persisted by the side of the newer -*ei*, -*eis*, -*i*, -*is*.   The re-formations -*ĭī*, -*ĭīs* were introduced in the literary language as early as Lucretius and almost entirely banished the contracted forms from formal discourse.   In common use, however, the pronunciation -*ī*, -*īs* predominated until after the end of the third century after Christ.   During the empire the spelling -*ii*, -*iis* was almost as common as the phonetic -*i*, -*is*.

Interpretation.—The plural cases   There is no doubt that the short forms in the plural are due to contraction (but compare Stolz, Historische Grammatik 220, and Müller's Handbuch II³ 2, 120, quoted above).   The origin *The genitive singular.* of the genitive singular in -*i* is not so clear.   There are two principal theories about it.   Brugmann, Grundriss II 585 f., followed by Lindsay, The Latin Language 380, and Stolz, Müller's Handbuch II³ 2, 125, calls *fili* a "genitivische Locativform" with -*ī*, the weak grade of the suffix *i̯o-*, *ii̯o-*.   The corresponding case of *o*-stems, he says, originally ended in -*ei̯*, but the diphthong became -*ī* earlier here than elsewhere through the influence of *fili* and so forth.   Hence the spelling with -*i* on the earliest Latin inscriptions.

Von Planta, Grammatik der oskisch-umbrischen Dialekte II 105 f., suggests that perhaps the Indo-European ending of the genitive singular of the *o*-declension was -*ī*, weak form of (*s*)-*i̯o*, before which the stem vowel was lost as before the suffix of *i̯o-* stems.

Brugmann's explanation is unsatisfactory for several reasons.   (1) If the genitive and locative singular of the *o*- and *i̯o*- stems were originally expressed by a single form it is strange that the two cases are kept separate in every language except Latin.   (2) There is no good evidence for a locative in -*ī* from the *i̯o*- stems.   Lith. *žõdyje*, etc., may be due to the analogy of the *i*- stems.   (See Wiedemann, Handbuch der litau-

ischen Sprache 66.) Sommer,[1] Handbuch der lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre 370, points out that even in Latin of the early period the longer form of this case seems to have existed beside the genitive in -*ī*. He quotes Ennius, Sat. 54 Müller (hexameter):

> Finis; *Brundusii* sargust; hunc magnus erit si,

and Terence, Eun. 519, where the tradition gives *Sunii*, but the meter permits either form.   (3) Such a locative is very strange in itself. We have locatives with weak stem form, but only from consonant stems where they could be influenced by the other oblique cases in which the weak stem was regular.   (See Brugmann, Grundriss II 610.)   In the *i̯o-* stems we have no evidence for the weak form of the suffix except in the nominative and accusative singular and in composition.[2]   At any rate a nominative -*ĭs* or a dative -*i̯ai̯* (or *i̯ei̯*) could not be responsible for the change of a locative -*i̯ei̯* (or -*ii̯ei̯*) to -*ī*.

There is nothing in the way of assuming that the original genitive singular ending of *o-* and *i̯o-* stems alike was -*ī*.   It is preserved only in Latin and Celtic.   The Oscan -*eis* is the ending of the *i-* stems.   (See Buck, Vocalismus der oskischen Sprache 154.)   The contraction of -*ĭī* in the *i̯o-* stems would occur very early.

II

The triple set of forms in use for the nominative plural and dative-ablative plural of *deus*, and for the nominative plural masculine and dative-ablative plural of the pronouns *is* and *idem*, presents a problem which has engaged the attention of the Roman grammarians and of many modern scholars, but which still offers much that is perplexing both as to the actual facts and as to their explanation.

The statements of the Roman grammarians (compare Brambach, Neugestaltung 137 ff.) show that they recognized

Deus, is, and idem.

Theories of the Roman grammarians.

---

[1] Sommer, however, does not go so far as Von Planta.   See ibid. p. 371.
[2] The evidence for the weak grade even in these positions has been steadily decreasing since the appearance of Streitberg's article (PBB. XIV, 165 ff.).   See Sievers, PBB. XVI, 566 f.; Hirt, IF. I 13; Streitberg, Urgermanische Grammatik 234; Wiedemann, Handbuch der litauischen Sprache 67; Von Planta, Grammatik d. oskisch-umbrischen Dialekte II 127 ff.; Lindsay, Lat. Lang. 375; Sommer, Handbuch der lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre 368 Anmerkung.

dii, ii, etc., as the normal spelling but with monosyllabic pronunciation. They put forward two theories to account for the writing of *ii* in a single syllable. The usual one is that the cases in question must have the same number of syllables as the nominative singular and therefore the *i* is doubled. This, of course, does not apply to the pronouns. Priscian, however, p. 298 Keil, says: "Puto autem, quod in his quoque differentiae causa servata est geminatio i, ne si di et dis, et i et is dicamus, dubitatio fiat significationis; nam di etiam praepositio est et dis et praepositio est et i et is verba. . . . Itaque in compositione idem et isdem per unam i scripsisse, quia nulla confusio sit significationis, inveniuntur pro eidem et eisdem." We are told that *dei, ei,* stood for dissyllables.

Discussions by modern scholars. Ritschl, Prolegomena to Plautus, Trin. XCVIII (1848), condemned the spelling with *ii* in editions of Plautus. The early forms were *di, i,* etc.[1] He thought, Opuscula IV 320 ff. (1855), that *ii, iis, iisdem* were still unknown in the time of Cicero, and that they belonged to the period of the decline. Lachmann, note on Lucretius IV 933 (1850), thought that the monosyllabic forms of the pronouns were the usual ones in the early period. Plautus, he said, occasionally used *ĭīs* and *ĕīs* and several times (probably) *ēīs (eieis* or *eiis).* Neue, Formenlehre I³ 161 ff., II³ 381 ff., 395,[2] concluded from the statements of the grammarians that *dii, diis* were pronounced *dī, dīs.* He also noted that the words were usually scanned as monosyllables by the early poets. The pronouns are similarly treated by the grammarians, but he thought that *iei, ieis* on republican inscriptions proved that the pronunciation *iī, iīs* was not unknown. For the compound, however, he recognized only *īdem* and *īsdem.* Mommsen, Hermes I 464 ff. (1866), published statistics from the Military Diplomas to show that *iis* was the favorite spelling under the empire. He found *is,* however, frequently during the period from 110 to 167, and *eis* twice in the years 71 and 80. Brambach, Neugestaltung 137-140 (1868), showed that Mommsen's deductions as to spelling were confirmed by the remarks of the Roman grammarians. *Dii* and *ii,* however, were pronounced *dī* and *ī.*

---

[1] So Brix, note on Trin. 17, and others.
[2] My references are to the third edition (1892 to 1902), but the first (1861) also contained these same statements with the possible exception of those about *deus.* The latter occur in Vol. I of the first edition, to which I have not had access.

Corssen, Aussprache II² 340 (1868), made the curious state-ment that *dis* appears after Caesar's Gallic War. Spillmann, Prog. St. Gallen, 1878, 21 f. (according to Neue, Formenlehre II³ 382), argued that Caesar always wrote *ii, iis*.[1] Bücheler-Windekilde, Grundriss der lateinischen Declination 38, 41, 129, 131 (1879), said that the occasional *deis* of literature was employed through metrical necessity. He followed Lachmann in his treatment of the pronouns. Thurneysen, Kuhn's Zeitschrift XXX 500 (1890), adopted Neue's view that *iei* and *ieis* were dissyllabic. He also gave *eeis* of the Senatus Consul-tum de Bacchanalibus its face value, and read *ei* and *eis* of republican inscriptions as *ī* and *īs*. Havet, Revue de Philo-logie XVI 74 f. (1892), thought that instead of *ii* having been invented by the grammarians, *i* had been invented by the Germans. The iambic shortening law would, in his opinion, make it possible to read *ĭĭ* wherever *ī* had been assumed in the early dramatists. During the same year, Bronisch, Die oskischen *i-* and *e-* Vocale 180, spoke of the "Thatsache . . . dass im lateinischen der Nominativus, Dativus, Ablativus Pluralis dieser Stämme (id est *eĭo-, meĭo-, deĭo-*) als ursprünglich einsilbige Längen durch Schreibung und Metrum und Gram-matiker erwiesen werden." Lindsay, Latin Language 19, 399, 439, 442 (1894), set up two series of forms, dissyllabic *dei, ei*, etc., and monosyllabic *di, i*, etc., also spelled *dii, ii*).[2] In Plautus, he said, Introduction to the Captivi of Plautus, pp. 27 f. (1900), *dei* and *deis* seem not to occur, while *ei* and *eis* are found only occasionally.

There is substantial agreement[3] in regard to the practice *Summary.* under the empire. All three spellings were employed, although *ii*, the favorite writing of the grammarians, was always pro-nounced *ī*. As to the republican usage it is agreed that the early dramatists regularly used the monosyllabic *di, dis*.[4] For the pronoun *is* there are no less than six distinct theories. (1) The pronunciations *ī, ĭĭ, eī* and *ēī* (and *eieis?*) are all assumed by Lachmann and Bücheler Windekilde. (2) Thur-

---

[1] He was followed by Meusel, Lexicon Caesarianum II 251 (1893).

[2] His remark, p. 21, that "*dii, diis* represented the pronunciation, although spelt *dei, deis* to agree with the other cases," must be a slip.

[3] Except for Havet.

[4] I can explain the remark quoted from Corssen only as a bit of carelessness. It helps but little to suppose that he referred to spelling, cf. Ritschl, Prolegomena p. 98.

neysen rejects only *ēī*.   (3) Neue finds evidence for *ī* and *ĭī*.
(4) Lindsay thinks that *ī* and *eī* were pronounced.   (5)
Bronisch reads all spellings *ī*.   (6) Havet thinks that the dis-
syllabic form *ĭī* (and also *eī?*) was the only one in use.

Before turning to the evidence we must notice briefly a dis-
cussion that touches our subject only indirectly.   Skutsch,
Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift 1894, 265 f., expressed
the belief that the dissyllabic pronunciation of *meo*, *suo*, etc.,
is the only one to be assumed for the early dramatists.   He
objected to the usual assumption of synizesis on the ground
that one could not tell where to read *meō* and where *meŏ* (with
iambic shortening) since each would form a half-foot equally
well.   Leo, Plautinische Forschungen 323 (1895), replied with
two new arguments for synizesis.   (1) The proceleusmaticus
never contains a shortened iambus in Plautus (compare id.
ibid. 245 f.), but feet like *eo quia* (that is *eō quia*) occur
a number of times.   (2) Plautus seldom puts a dactyl in the
fourth place of the trochaic septenarius, and especially seldom
a dactyl containing a shortened iambus; but he sometimes con-
structs the foot of a long syllable followed by *eō*, *meumst*,
etc.   In an article entitled "Iambenkürzung und Synizese,"
Satura Viadrina 122-144, Skutsch undertook a thorough sifting
of the arguments for synizesis in the early dramatists.   He
did not disprove the phenomenon,[1] but he showed that the
evidence for it is extremely scanty.   He completely demolished
Leo's two arguments by citing a number of passages which con-
tain shortened iambi in the positions in question.[2]

Now, Skutsch's observation that *meŏ* makes as good a half-
foot as *meō* suggests a similar objection to the usual dogma
that only *dī* and *dīs* are found in Plautus.   Indeed we may say
that *dī* would be certain only (1) as the final syllable of an
iambic cadence, or (2) as the second syllable of a resolved the-
sis or arsis, being shortened by the iambic law (that is,
$\smile \underset{\smile}{} dĭ \smile$ or $\underset{\smile}{} \smile dĭ \underset{\smile}{}$), or (3) where the meter requires the
complete loss of the word by elision.   For *dīs*, of course, the
third case is excluded.

We must remember, however, that while a long monosylla-
ble, even one of very frequent use, might never occur in one of
these three positions, an iambic word would be almost certain

---

[1] Cf. Lindsay, Introduction to the Captivi pp. 26 ff.
[2] Cf. Lindsay, ibid. p. 40.

to betray itself.   That is, it would be almost certain to occur in positions where a monosyllable could not be substituted for it.   For example, we must read *dĕae*, not *dēaĕ* at Merc. 793:

At té, vicine, di *deae*que pérduint.

If, then, we find no places where the words are certainly dissyllables we shall be safe in calling them monosyllables.

For our cases of *deus* this seems to be the state of affairs in Plautus[1] and Terence.[2]   I find the nominative in Plautus 287 times and in Terence 80 times, the dative-ablative in Plautus 25 times and in Terence 6 times.   But in every instance where the meter is at all certain it will admit either a monosyllable or a dissyllable.

Nominative and dative-ablative plural of deus.—The early period.

In several passages, to be sure, the manuscripts read *di*, *dii* or *dis* where the meter requires a dissyllable.   But the trouble is not always helped by reading *deīs*.   Ps. 1253, the only case of the sort, I think, which is preserved in the Ambrosian Palimpsest, runs:

Ita victu excurato, íta magnis munditiis *dis* dignis.

The place of *dis* must evidently be supplied by a trochee or one of its equivalents.   Götz and Schöll in the edition of 1896 read *di*[*vi*]*s*.   That *divus* is used as a substantive by Plautus has been shown by Leo, Rheinisches Museum XXXVIII 3. This emendation is certainly preferable to Studemund's [*et*] *dis* which Götz adopted in the edition of 1887 and Leo retains in his edition of 1896.   Likewise in the bacchiac hexameter at Amph. 635 *dīvīs* (with Götz and Schöll), not *deīs*, must be read.

Ita *di*[*vi*]*s* est plácitum, volúptatem ut maeror comés consequátur.

In the trochaic verse at Truc. 701,

Di[*v*]*i* magni! ut égo [nunc] laetus sum ét laetitia dífferor!

(So Schöll, 1881), I think that *divi* is probable whatever one does with the rest of the verse.   Götz and Schöll (1896) give the line up.   Hence we need have no hesitation in accepting the emendation *dīvī* where *deī* also is possible.   This is the case

---

[1] I have used the edition of Götz and Schöll, Leipzig, 1893-1898.
[2] I have used the edition of Dziatzko, Leipzig, 1884.

at Merc. 436 (Seyffert); Most. 222 (Bothe); Rud. 1316 (Leo), where Götz and Schöll (1896) write *Di homines* although Schöll (1887) followed Leo.   Neue, Formenlehre I³ 164, cites *deis* at Ps. 1258 as dissyllabic.   Ritschl (1850) made the verse a bacchiac tetrameter:

> *Deís* proxumum ésse arbitrór suaví[tatem].

Götz (1887) read an iambic dimeter:

> *Deís* próxumum esse [hoc] árbitror.

(Compare the discussion ad loc. and the references given there.)   Götz and Schöll (1896) prefer hiatus to the insertion of *hoc*.   A line whose scansion is so uncertain has no value as evidence, and in any case *divis* is admissible.

In every instance, then, the meter permits either *di, dis* or *dei, deis,* and, according to the principle laid down above, we should prefer the former.

Other forms of deus *compared.*

But the case is not so weak as that.   *Deos, deae,* and *deas* do not occur with anything like the frequency of *di* and yet the meter requires that they be read as dissyllables in a number of passages.   The following list is incomplete:

> *deos*—Cas. 670; Cist. 242; Poen. 950; And. 522; Hec. 476; Ad. 693.
> *deae*—Curc. 719; Merc. 793; Mil. 501; 725; Phor. 687; Hec. 102.
> *deas*—Cas. 670; Poen. 950.

Corresponding forms of meus *compared.*

Furthermore we may compare the nominative plural masculine and the dative-ablative plural of the common word *meus* which presents nearly the same rhythmical and phonetic character as *deus*.   We must read *mei, meis* at the following places:

> *mei*—Merc. 348; Mil. 815; Trin. 1163; Truc. 741.
> *meis*—Amph. 967; As. 67; 504; 629; Ba. 598; Capt. 520; 536; Cas. 116; Men. 597; 849; 1001; Mil. 167; 290; 1104; Merc. 787 (*meeis* in the Ambrosian Palimpsest); Pers. 813; Poen. 473; 1000; Ps. 127; 779; Rud. 972; 974; Stich. 81; 580; 679; Trin. 509; 846; Truc. 378; Heaut. 491; 699; Hec. 271; 720; Ad. 563; 879.

There is no reason for this difference in the treatment of *di* and *dis* on the one hand, and of *deos, deae, deas, mei* and *meis* on

the other, unless the former are monosyllables and the latter are dissyllables.[1]

The spelling of the Ambrosian Palimpsest points to the monosyllabic pronunciation. *Di* is preserved in numerous places; for example, Cist. 512; 522; Mil. 701; Most. 655; 668; 684; 717; Pers. 292; 296; 298; 483; 488; 492; 581; 639; Poen. 439; 449; 667; Ps. 271; 943; 1130; 1230; 1294; Stich. 505; 595; 685. *Dei* (for example, Cist. 497; Men. 451; Poen. 460; 588; 687; 751; 859; 900; 909; 967; 988; 1219; 1252; 1253; 1255; 1258; 1274) and *deis* (for example, Capt. 922; Ep. 675; Pers. 26; 332; Poen. 452; Stich. 296) are ambiguous. The rarer *dii* and *diis* may be modernized forms of *di*, *dis* or of *dei*, *deis*. In either case they indicate a monosyllable. (Compare pages 12 ff.) I know of no spelling of this word similar to *meeis*, Merc. 787 (Ambrosian Palimpsest).

Spelling of the Ambrosian manuscript of Plautus.

All doubt vanishes as soon as we turn to the contemporary hexameters of Ennius. We must read *di* at Ann. 116 Müller, and *dis* at Ann. 110; 117; 203; 233 Müller.

Di and dis in Ennius.

The earliest instance of the dissyllabic pronunciation in poetry is in Catullus. From his time on it was used with increasing frequency, especially in the dative-ablative. I give a few statistics which are intended to be complete for the ground covered.[2]

Classical and late Latin.— Evidence of poetry.

	di	dei	dis	deis
Lucretius			3	
Catullus....................	9		1	1
Vergil	27		13	
Horace....................	21		14	
Propertius	11			1
Ovid......................	102	9	45	6
Persius...................		1	4	
Lucan	7	5	2	25
Martial...................	9	7		3
Juvenal..................	4		8	3

[1] In this connection it is interesting to note that at a later period, when *dei* and *deis* had been introduced by the analogy of the other forms, we find *deis* at the end of a trochaic septenarius. Bücheler 227 = Corpus III 47:

Aúdit et donát Camena, músa nam cordí *deis.*

[2] I have used the following editions: Lucretius—Brieger, Leipzig, 1894. Catullus—Ellis, Oxford, 1878. Vergil—Ribbeck, Leipzig, 1862 (only the Eclogues, Georgics and Aeneid). Horace—Hirschfelder, Berlin, 1886. (I have relied on the index.) Propertius—L. Müller, Leipzig, 1894. Ovid—Merkel, Leipzig, Vol. I[1] 1887, II[2], III[2] 1897. Persius—Conington, Oxford, 1874. Lucan—Hosius, Leipzig, 1892. Martial—Gilbert, Leipzig, 1886. Juvenal—Hermann, Leipzig, 1890.

I add a list of the passages where I have found the dissyllabic forms:

dei—Ovid, Met. II 389; VIII 650; IX 241; 259; XIV 592; 673; Trist. I 2, 59; Ex P. I 5, 70; Fast. IV 788; Persius VI 30; Lucan I 634; III 36; IV 123; 493; V 240; Martial I 103, 4; V 19, 4; VII 60, 4; VIII 4, 4; IX 3, 4; XI 60, 9; XII 6, 10.

deis—Catullus IV 22; Propertius V 1, 5; Ovid, Trist. IV 2, 12; Ex P. III 5, 54; IV 5, 26; Fast. I 615; 706; 707; Lucan I 35; 128; II 93; 306; III 243; 423; 743; V 42; 124; 352; 499; 636; 778; VI 49; 431; 441; 513; 736; VII 705; VIII; 665; 863; IX 161; 188; 1098; X 177; Martial I 103, 12; IX 61, 19; 101, 21; Juvenal VIII 216; XII 2; XIII 114.

semidei—Ovid, Met. I 192; XIV 673; Lucan IX 7.

Evidence of the inscriptions.   Our forms of *deus* scarcely occur on republican inscriptions. *Dis*, Corpus I 639, and *deis*, Corpus I 1241, are the only instances I know of.   From the time of Augustus on, however, they are exceedingly frequent.   I get these statistics from Corpus VI 1—30681.

di	dii	dei	dis	diis	deis
9	7	2	1860	427	9

The writing *di, dis* is a little more than four times as frequent as *dii, diis*.   *Dei* and *deis* are so rare that it will be worth while to cite the inscriptions where I have found them.   *Dei* occurs 24520, 29265; *deis*, 629, 2825, 8434, 16074, 17512, 17622, 20431, 25063, 27310.   Most of the forms are on inscriptions which cannot be dated, but there is no doubt that *di, dis* is the usual spelling at all periods.   I have found *dis* 28 times and *diis* 11 times on inscriptions later than 300 A.D.

The spelling dii, diis for dī, dīs.   We have seen that the grammarians mention two pronunciations of our cases—*dī, dīs* and *deī, deīs*.   The spelling *dii, diis*, they say, stood for *dī, dīs*.   This is precisely the state of affairs that we find in the metrical inscriptions.   *Dī* is scanned as a monosyllable in the following places:
Bücheler 596 = Corpus X 5958; Bücheler 1036 = Corpus VI 28877; Bücheler 1057 = Corpus VI 24520; Bücheler 1116; Bücheler 1164 = Corpus VI 29426; Bücheler 1224 = Corpus VI 19874; Bücheler 1458.   *Dis* is a monosyllable at Bücheler 346;

Bücheler 418 = Ephemeris Epigraphica V 36; Bücheler 878 = Corpus II 761 and Addenda, page XL. *Dei* is an iambus at Bücheler 1057 = Corpus VI 24520 (probably); Bücheler 1184 = Corpus VI 18385; Bücheler 1305 = Corpus IX 4810; Bücheler 1310 = Corpus III 6475, supplementum 10762; Bücheler 1551 A = Corpus X 7570. *Deis* is an iambus at Bücheler 227 = Corpus III 47. *Dii* is scanned as a monosyllable at Bücheler 816 = Corpus VI 18296; Bücheler 1114 = Corpus VI 30114. *Diis* at Bücheler 1583, line 7 = Corpus VI 9659 stands for an iambus if Bücheler's arrangement is correct. It is probably a
- stone-cutter's blunder for *deis*.

There is no doubt, then, that *dii, diis* should be read as monosyllables, and that all instances of this spelling should be added to our list of examples of *ii=ī* (above, p. 12 f.).[1] As already shown, this spelling originated with the *ịo-* and *ịā-* stems, and spread to other words. It became especially common in *dii* and *diis* on account of the scholastic law referred to on p. 16, to the effect that no case of a noun can have fewer syllables than its nominative singular.

The extreme rarity of *dei* and *deis* on prose inscriptions as against the comparative frequency of these forms in the poets and on metrical inscriptions indicates that they were peculiar to the literary language. *Dei and deis are peculiar to the literary language.*

Di and *dis* are the only forms for which we have evidence from the early period, and the colloquial speech seems to have known no others even under the empire. The spelling *dii, diis* (for *dī, dīs*) was the favorite one in the schools and appears on imperial inscriptions about one-fourth as often as *di, dis*. The re-formations *dei* and *deis* appeared in the literary language in the time of Caesar, and became very common by the middle of the first century A.D.; but *di* and *dis* still continued in good use. *Summary.*

The history of the pronouns cannot be so satisfactorily disposed of. *Nominative plural masculine and dative-ablative plural of is and idem.*

I find no certain instance of *i* or *is* in the early poets. Georges, Lexicon der lateinischen Wortformen, s. v., quotes *i* from Trin. 17 and Truc. 745, and adds "sonst unsichere *—Evidence of the early poetry.*

---

[1] Accordingly, the editors are correct in writing the dissyllables of the poets *dei* and *deis*. Gildersleeve's *dii* (*dii*) at Persius VI 30, is wrong. Is Brambach directly responsible for the emendation, or only indirectly through his canon that *dii* is the correct spelling?

Vermutung." In each of these passages the meter will permit a dissyllable on the assumption of the operation of the iambic shortening law. At Men. 972[1] one would rather read *īs* than *ĕĭs*, with iambic shortening, if he regards the verse as trochaic (with Schöll, 1889), thus:

Réccordetur íd, qui nihili súnt quid *eis* prétí—

or as bacchiac (with Ritschl, 1851). Leo, however, makes the line a combination of a bacchiac dimeter catalectic and an iambic dimeter, thus:

Recordetur id,   qui nihili sunt, quid *eis* preti.

The most probable instance of *īs* for the early period is at Ennius, Ann. 320 Müller:

Is pernas succidit iniqua superbia Poeni,

quoted by Festus, 438 Thewrewk de Ponor, where Paulus reads *his*. Lucian Müller's reason for preferring *his* is: De Re Metrica[2] 297, "quis enim credet poetas dactylicos ibi usos contractionum insolentia, ubi liceret eis uti pronominis *hic* paratis formis *magisque vividis?*" Perhaps the position at the beginning of the line favors the stronger pronoun, but as long as we are ignorant of the context one certainly inclines to the reading of Festus.

In the following six passages we must read *ĕī* and *ĕīs*: Merc. 869:

Nón amittunt hí me comites quí tenent.   Qui súnt *eí?*

Rud. 73:

Sedént eiecti: návis confractást *eis.*

Curc. 373:

Diués sum, si non réddo *eis* quibus débeo.

Poen. 167:

Satis súnt trecenti.   Quíd *eis*[2] facturús?   Tace.

---

[1] Probably no one nowadays would defend the scansion *eis*, proposed for this line by Lachmann, note on Lucretius IV 934, and adopted by Bücheler-Windekilde, Grundriss der lateinischen Declination, p. 131.

The editors keep the *iis* of the manuscripts.

Stich. 17 (anapaestic dimeter catalectic):

Nosque ab eís abducére volt.

Eun. 250:

Séd [e]ís ultro adrídeo et eorum íngenia admiror simul.

Trin. 625 also belongs here if we follow Camerarius and read *ei*
for the senseless *in* of the manuscripts, and Men. 585 if it is an
iambic octonarius. *Ei* at Naevius, Bellum Poenicum 45 Müller,
is read as a dissyllable by the adherents of the quantitative (for
example, L. Müller) and accentual (for example, Lindsay,
American Journal of Philology XIV 154, 320) schools. But
where both text and meter are so uncertain we cannot attach
much weight to the form.

The meter requires *eidem* at Mil. 758

Séd [e]ídem hominis númquam dicunt, quámquam adposi-

tumst ámpliter.

At Ennius, Ann. 194, Müller's text requires us to read *isdem*,
but the fragment is hopelessly corrupt.

There is a badly corrupted passage at Cicero, Or. 157,
which has been supposed to refer to Ennius's use of the ablative
plural *isdem*. Ritschl, Opuscula IV 319 ff., discusses the
point at length and decides to read with change of the position
of *probavit*:

Isdem campus habet inquit Ennius, et *in templis isdem.*
Eisdem erat verius: nec tamen probavit ut opimius, male
sonabat isdem: impetratum est a consuetudine ut peccare
suavitatis causa liceret.

Heerdegen (Leipzig, 1884) restores the order of the manu-
scripts and reads:

Isdem campus habet inquit Ennius; et in templis: *eidem
probavit*; at isdem erat verius, nec tamen eisdem ut opimius,
male sonabat isdem: etc.

This is certainly better than Ritschl's reading, although it is
still far from lucid. At any rate it is clear that the passage
cannot count as evidence on our question.

So all the direct evidence that we have points toward the

longer forms in the early poets. But if these forms were the only ones in use, is it not strange that we find only seven (including the one instance of *eidem*) passages where the meter requires a dissyllable? In order to answer this question I have compared other cases of the pronoun *is* which were certainly dissyllabic. The following table contains complete statistics for Plautus and Terence in the case of the nominative plural masculine and the dative-ablative plural. The statistics on the ablative singular (all genders) and the accusative plural masculine and feminine cover the Assin., Bacch. and Merc. of Plautus.

	ei	*eo* and *ea*	*eis*	*eos* and *eas*
dissyllabic	1	3	5	2
doubtful.	9	15	31	7

There is no reason, then, for continuing the time-honored statement that Plautus usually employed the monosyllabic *i* and *is*. Still, we shall see (page 35) that these forms were probably in use in his day, and we may scan in that way sometimes.

The following tables are intended to contain all the forms of the nominative plural masculine and the dative-ablative plural of *is* and *idem* that occur on the numbered inscriptions of Corpus I, except where abbreviated:

Nominative Plural Masculine

ANNO URBIS CONDITAE	CORPUS	*ei*	*eis*	*iei*	*ieis*	*eeis*
before 535	185			1(?)		
568	196					1
621-636	197		2			
631-2	198		4			
637	199		1(*eus*)			
643	200	3				
649	577				1	
673	202	4		1		
683	204	1		˙ 5		
about 705	205			1		
709	206	3		1		

Dative-Ablative Plural

ANNO URBIS CONDITAE	CORPUS	*eis*	*ieis*	*eieis*	*eeis*	*is*
494[1]	195	1				
568	196				2	
631-2	198	8				1
637	199	2				
643	200	10				
mid. VII century	201			2		
673	202	13				
676	203	7				
683	204		12			
696	603	1				
about 705	205		4			
709	206	15[2]	9[2]			
710	624		1			

	NOMINATIVE PLURAL MASCULINE				DATIVE-ABLATIVE PLURAL		
anno urbis conditae	*eidem*	*eisdem*	*idem*	*isdem*	*eisdem*	*isdem*	*iisdem*
621-636	I 197						
631-632		I 198					
648	I 566						
648	I 567						
673	I 202(5)						
683					I 204		
709						I 206	I 206(?)
	I 1140	1143	I 1421	I 1270 (*is[dem]*)			
	1161	1149	1285 (*i[dem]*)				
	1162	1187					
	1163	1192(?)					
	1178						
	1189						
	1216						
	1227						
	1245						
	1247						

The evidence for the period before 600 a. u. c. is extremely scanty. *Eis* of the Columna Rostrata must stand for a monosyllable if the form is genuine; for at this period the diphthong in unaccented syllables had only reached the stage $\bar{e}$ and could not be written *i*. But perhaps the spelling is as modern as that of *Poenicas*, *praesente*, and *aes* of the same inscription (compare p. 7, footnote). *Iei* on one of the old inscriptions from

---

[1] On the date of this inscription, see above p. 7, footnote.

[2] Corpus I, Index vocabulorum, omits *ineis*, line 27 and line 96, and *abieis*, line 148 and line 154.

Venusia, Corpus I 185 = IX 439, is very doubtful.   The stone has been lost, and the extant transcriptions are evidently not exact.   In fact, they do not quite agree about our word.   The readings are: *ieid* (Cimaglia), *iei* (Lupoli), *iei* (Aegyptius), *et* (Fabretti), *lel* (Saracen).   Mommsen's *ieis* seems in itself a probable conjecture.   Still, as the only spellings that we find for more than a hundred years from the time of this inscription are *eeis, ei* and *eis*, a good deal of scepticism is justifiable. The only sixth century form that one can rely on is *eeis* of the Senatus Consultum de Bacchanalibus.   It tallies precisely with what we have learned from Plautus and Terence.   For the first half of the seventh century the common spelling is *ei, eis, eidem, eisdem*.   At this period *ei* is usually ambiguous.   But the Tabula Bantina (Corpus I 197) consistently writes *ei* for *ī* in plural case endings and accordingly *eis* and *eidem* must stand for *is* and *idem*.   *Is* of the Lex Repetnndarum is, of course, a monosyllable.   The spelling *iei, ieis* appears with the year 649 and is very common for the next one hundred years.   We have seen (p. 8) that *iei* sometimes stands for *ī* and it may well do so here.   Similarly *eieis* of the Senatus Consultum de Tiburtibus probably stands for *eīs*.

Idem, is[*dem*] (nominative plural) and *isdem* (709 a. u. c.) are clear.   *Iisdem*, 206, (beside *isdem*) is probably for *īsdem*. There are, as far as I know, only three other instances of the writing *ii* on republican inscriptions.   *Ingenuiis*, I 1492, must stand for *ingenuīs*.   *Statii, Caesii* (genitive singular), Corpus I 757 and 758 respectively, stand on difficult inscriptions of doubtful date and authenticity (see Mommsen ad loc.).   Brambach, Neugestaltung 140, points out that in *iisdem* there is a space after the first *i*, and sees in that fact an indication that the spelling is a graver's error.   I think it is more probably an early instance of the use of *ii* = *ī*.

Dissyllabic *ei* and *eis* do not occur in any of the later poets[1] that I have examined—Lucretius, Catullus, Vergil, Horace, Propertius, Ovid, Persius, Lucan, Martial, Juvenal.   *Is* and *iis* occur sometimes in the best manuscripts, but the editors

---

[1] Meader-Wölfflin, ALL. XI 373 f., says that the nominative plural *ei, ii* is wanting in golden, silver and late Latin poetry. For the dative-ablative plural "das ganze Belegmaterial bescränkt sich auf eine Stelle des Manilius 11 744:

Viresque in eis et iura capessunt,

wozu noch die andere unsichere Stelle II, 377 hinzukommt."

always write *his* (see Lachmann, note on Lucretius IV 934; Neue, Formenlehre II³ 386). The very extensive confusion of *i* and *is* with *hi* and *his* makes the manuscript reading of very little authority on this point (see Lindsay, note on Plautus, Capt. 2). And it has been thought that the more dignified poets had a prejudice against the pronoun *is* (see Meader, The Latin Pronouns 6 ff.) and especially against the contractions *i* and *is* (compare the remark of L. Müller, de Re Metrica² 297, quoted above, p. 24).

Ziegel, De is et hic pronominibus quatenus confusa sint apud antiquos, attempts to show by the collation of certain manuscripts that scribes of the fifth century substituted *hi* and *his* for the corresponding cases of *is* (1) where the pronoun was used with a substantive, and (2) where it was followed by the relative. A change in the other direction was extremely rare. He remarks (p. 60): "Certe tamen nonnumquam etiam in libris classicae aetatis edendis et recensendis illa praecepta quibus librarii a quinto saeculo paruerunt cognovisse ex usu fore expectamus." He then shows in detail how his theory restores several instances of the weaker pronoun to the text of Vitruvius. As remarked by Meader, The Latin Pronouns, p. 23, his results cannot be accepted until they receive confirmation from other manuscripts. Still it is likely that some instances of *hi* and *his* in our present editions of the poets enumerated above will eventually be read *i* and *is*.

I find *idem* and *isdem* in the later poets as follows:

The forms of idem.

	īdem	*īsdem*
Lucretius	2	1[1]
Vergil	3	1
Horace	2	4
Propertius		1
Ovid	6	16
Lucan	1	
Juvenal	1	4

Juvenal uses *eisdem* also at XIV 30:

Implet et ad moechum dat *eisdem* ferre cinaedis.

L. Müller, de Re Metrica² 298, condemns the reading *eisdem* at Claudian XVIII 412.

---

[1] At II 692, but cf. Lachmann, note on IV 934.

We have noticed that *ei*, *eis* and *iei*, *ieis* were the usual spellings on inscriptions of the last sixty years of the republic. The same system remained in vogue up to about the beginning of the Christian era: for example, *eis* Corpus VI 1375 twice (after 723 a. u. c.); *iei* Ephemeris Epigraphica VIII, p. 225 ff. twice (Acta Ludorum Saecularium anni 737 u. c.); *ieis* l. c. twice.

Soon after that date, however, the use of *ei* and *iei* for *i* died out, and consequently our forms were spelled differently. The following tables give statistics for Corpus VI 1—30681, and from a number of other inscriptions[1] most of which can be dated. I have omitted all instances of *iei* and *ieis*, and all of *eis* where it may stand for *is* (for example, Corpus XI 1421 line 54, beside *spoleis* line 35).

	ei	ii	i	eis	iis	is
Corpus VI		5		15	11	5
Other inscriptions—						
first century	11	13	1	14	116	24
second century.		1		9	47	29
third century.......					11	4
doubtful date				3	3	
	11	19	1	41	188	62

	idem	eisdem	iisdem	isdem
Corpus VI..................	11	3		91
Other inscriptions.		1	1	5
	11	4	1	96

We have also *isdem* (nominative plural) Corpus VI 2041, 56; 2078 II 10; 23318; and *idem* (=*isdem*) Corpus VI 2075 II 34.

The great predominance of the spelling *iis* is due to the Military Diplomas which give *eis* 3 times, *iis* 142 times and *is*

[1] The Military Diplomas, Corpus III pp. 843 ff.; Eph. Ep. II pp. 454 ff., IV pp. 181 ff., 495 ff., V pp. 92 ff., 610 ff., 652 ff.; Corpus XII 4333; the Decrees of the Municipal Senate of Pisae, Corpus XI 1420, 1421; the Monumentum Ancyranum, Corpus III pp. 769 ff.; the Edict of Claudius, Corpus V 5050; Corpus X 1401; the Epistula Vespasiani ad Vanacinos, Bruns, Fontes Juris 192=Or. 4031; the Leges Malacitana et Salpensana, Corpus II 1963, 1964; The Lex Metalli Vipascensis, Eph. Ep. III pp. 165 f.; the Lex Coloniae Genetivae, Eph. Ep. II pp. 105 ff., III pp. 91 ff.; the Obligatio Praediorum of Trajan, Corpus XI 1147; the Lex Manciana, L'Année Epigr. 1897 pp. 13-19; Corpus XI 3614; XIV 2112; Eph. Ep. VIII pp. 316 ff.; Corpus IX 2438; the Aes Italicense, Eph. Ep. VII p. 385 Tab. A.; Corpus XIII 2036; III 781; the Acta Ludorum Saecularium of A.D. 204, Eph. Ep. VIII pp. 274 f.; Corpus X 114; XII 3861; 6038; Eph. Ep. V 498; 1218.

36 times. In Hermes I 465 ff., Mommsen published statistics from these inscriptions which brought out some striking peculiarities in their spelling of the pronouns. I include the instances from inscriptions published since Mommsen wrote.

A.D.	eis	iis	is
–108	1	102	6
110–166	2	23	27
167–300		17	3

That is, the spelling *iis* is almost always used except from 110 to 166. Mommsen ascribes the more frequent appearance of *is* during these years to the archaizing tendencies of the period. But no such peculiarities are to be observed on other state inscriptions. We find *is* three times on the Edict of Claudius, Corpus V 5050; once on the Letter of Vespasian, Bruns. 192; fourteen times on the Leges Malacitana et Salpensana, Corpus II 1963, 1964; and *eis* once on the Lex Malacitana; and twelve times on the Lex Coloniae Genetivae, Ephemeris Epigraphica II 105 ff., III 91 ff. Furthermore the Military Diplomas show other similar peculiarities of orthography. *Stipendiis* occurs sixteen times before 110. On the diploma of that year (number XXV in the Corpus) we have *stipendiis* once and *stipendis* twice. After 110 we have *stipendis* twelve times without a single instance of the longer form. I think that the explanation lies in the fact that up to about 110 the diplomas followed closely an exact legal formula,[1] which happened to contain the longer spelling *iis*. At about that date, however, the care with which the documents were executed seems to have waned. This is seen especially in the use of extensive abbreviations. In a decree of 113 or 114, Corpus III, p. 869, the inside copy of the text abbreviates nearly every polysyllable except proper names. And so, from 110 on, we find the same variation in orthography that is seen on other state inscriptions. As to the period after 167 our material is very scanty, both that from the diplomas and that from other sources. But it is altogether likely that the spelling *iis* gained ground during the third century.

---

[1] There is some variation in the first part of the decrees which contains the description of the soldiers concerned; but the phraseology of the second part—the decree proper—in which nearly all of the pronominal forms occur, hardly varies at all.

If we subtract the figures of the Military Diplomas from the table given above I think that we shall not be far from the average practice of the empire.   This gives us:

eis	*iis*	*is*
38	46	26

These figures go very well with those given above for the nominative; except that *i* was especially unpopular:

ei	*ii*	*i*
11	19	1

The spellings *ii* and *iis* of course represented monosyllables. As we have seen (p. 16) Priscian says that *ii* was written to distinguish the pronominal from the verbal forms *i* and *is*.   Perhaps there was a more urgent need of a mark to distinguish the nominative singular *is* from the dative-ablative plural *is*.   The very shortness of the form *i* may have made the spelling *ii* more popular.

Idem shows almost always the short forms *idem* and *isdem*. *Eisdem* on Corpus VI 2083 a; 2099 III 11; 2101; Ephemeris Epigraphica V 1218 goes with Juvenal's *eisdem*.   *Iisdem* on a Military Diploma of the year 249, Corpus III p. 899, is as much of a curiosity as *suiis*, etc.   (See above pp. 12 f.)

Summary.   The dissyllabic *ei* and *eis* (written *eeis* on the Senatus Consultum de Bacchanalibus, and *eieis* on the Senatus Consultum de Tiburtibus), were in use throughout the history of the language.   The monosyllabic *i* and *is* (spelled also *ei*, *eis* and *iei*, *ieis* in the early period, and *ii*, *iis* later) are certain from about a. u. c. 630 on.   They were the usual forms under the empire.

Eidem and *eisdem*(?) were probably the forms employed by the early poets.   *Idem* and *isdem* (spelled also *eidem* and *eisdem* in the early period) are certain from a. u. c. 621-636 on. Under the empire they were almost the only forms in use.

III

Interpretation.   We·have, then, to account for two sets of forms, *dei*, *ei*, etc., and *di*, *i*, etc.   Only the second series calls for any explanation. Several theories have been suggested.

Several theories which have been advanced.   Corssen, Aussprache II² 699 (1870), says that in *dis* and *isdem* the *i* is "aus der Lautfolge *ei* getrübt in *de - is*, *e - is - dem*."   What he means to say at II² 340 I cannot understand.

Georges, Lexicon der lateinischen Wortformen, s. v. *deus* (1890), speaks of *di* and *dis* as syncopated. Thurneysen, Kuhn's Zeitschrift XXX 499 f. (1890), derives *di*, etc., from *dei*, etc., by a process of two stages. (1) *ě* became *ĭ* before *ei* (> *ī*). His evidence, aside from the pronominal forms *iei* and *ieis*, is: *mieis* Corpus I 38 (scanned as a monosyllable); the statement of Velius Longus, p. 77 Keil, that Terence wrote *miis; abiegnieis* and *aesculnieis* Corpus I 577, beside *abiegnea* (twice) and *abiegneas*. (2) Contraction took place.[1] Bronisch, die oskischen *i*- und *e*- Vocale 180 ff. (1892), assumes that in primitive italic $e\underset{\circ}{\imath}o\underset{\circ}{\imath}$ contracted to $\bar{o}\underset{\circ}{\imath}$ on the loss of intervocalic $\underset{\circ}{\imath}$. Hence *dī* goes back to *$d\bar{o}\underset{\circ}{\imath}$* (< *$de\underset{\circ}{\imath}o\underset{\circ}{\imath}$*).[2] Lindsay, Introduction to the Captivi of Plautus 27 (1900), suggests that *di* and *dis* may be from *divi* and *divis*.

The remarks of Corssen and Georges require no comment. The Oscan support of Bronisch's theory vanished on the discovery, independently by Buck, Vocalismus der oskischen Sprache 93 f., and Von Planta, Grammatik der oskisch-umbrischen Dialekte I 63, 175 ff., that Oscan *i* and *i* represent the close *ě* in hiatus. His vulgar Latin forms *dō*, *dae*, etc., have little in their favor since Skutsch's article on synizesis in Satura Viadrina (compare Stolz, Müller's Handbuch II³ 2, 34). *Di* and *dis* could hardly come from *$d\bar{o}\underset{\circ}{\imath}$* and *$d\bar{o}\underset{\circ}{\imath}s$* in any case; for accented $o\underset{\circ}{\imath}$ would yield *ū*, and forms of *deus* could hardly be used as enclitics or proclitics.

Thurneysen's view is also untenable. Both of his processes must have been completed before the time of Plautus, with whom the forms were already monosyllabic. But we have seen that $o\underset{\circ}{\imath}$ in the case-endings had only reached the stage *ē* at that period. The process $\check{e}\bar{e} > \check{\imath}\bar{e} > \bar{e}$ is improbable in itself, and furthermore we have seen (pp. 5 f.) that the combination $\check{\imath}\bar{e}$, in the $\underset{\circ}{\imath}o$- and $\underset{\circ}{\imath}\bar{a}$- stems, never contracts in Plautus.

Lindsay's derivation of *di* and *dis* from *divi* and *divis* is shattered on the same rock. There is no evidence that *u* was lost before $o\underset{\circ}{\imath}$ or between *ī* and *ē*. In any case $\bar{\imath}\bar{e}$ would be no more likely to contract than $\check{\imath}\bar{e}$.

The problem presented by *di* and *dis* differs somewhat accord-

---

[1] Thurneysen's theory has been adopted by Brugmann, Grundriss II 770, I² 123; Lindsay, Latin Language 19; Stolz, Müller's Handbuch II³ 2, 26; Sommer, Handbuch der lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre 379.

[2] He was followed by Stolz in the Historische Grammatik, pp. 16 f., and in the first two editions of Müller's Handbuch.

59

The history of
deus *and the*
origin of di
and dis.
ing to the view that one holds of the history of *deus*.   Thurney-
sen,[1] Kuhn's Zeitschrift XXVIII 155, assumes that after
*dei̯uos became **dei̯os* the *ei̯* went through the usual development
to *ẹ̄*.   Then *ẹ̄* was shortened on account of the hiatus.   Solm-
sen,[2] Lateinische Lautgeschichte 71 (compare Lindsay, Latin
Language 244), prefers to suppose that after the loss of *u*
*dei̯os became **deos* by the regular loss of *i̯* between vowels.
He objects to Thurneysen's theory, "Wäre aber in diesem
falle nicht **dĭus* an stelle von *dĕus* zu erwarten?"   If *deus* goes
back to **dẹ̄os* (<**dei̯os*), the dative-ablative plural (supposing
that the declension of *deus* was filled out by analogy at the
earliest possible moment) must have passed through the stages
*dei̯oi̯s and **dẹ̄ẹ̄s*.   If *deus* goes back to **deos* (<**dei̯os*), the
corresponding stages of the dative-ablative plural are **dei̯oi̯s*
and **deẹ̄s*.   Either **dẹ̄ẹ̄s* or **deẹ̄s* would naturally contract into
dẹ̄s.   Hence *di* and *dis* (in the time of Plautus and Terence
dẹ̄ and *dẹ̄s*) go back to **dẹ̄ẹ̄* and **dẹ̄ẹ̄s* or to **deẹ̄* and **deẹ̄s*.

Contraction in
the case forms
is, meus, *and*
other eo- *stems.*
The corresponding cases of *is* and also of *meus* and all other
eo- stems must have suffered a similar contraction of *eẹ̄* to *ẹ̄*.[3]
We have seen that the evidence does not require us to
assume monosyllabic forms of the nominative plural mas-
culine and dative-ablative plural of *is* before the seventh
century of the city.   There is nothing, however, against sup-
posing that they existed beside the dissyllables.   In fact
we have seen a number of more or less uncertain indica-
tions of their existence during the early period in *eis* of the
Columna Rostrata, *is* (or *eis?*) at Plautus, Men. 972, *is* (or
his?) at Ennius, Ann. 320 Müller, and *isdem*(?) at Ennius,
Ann. 194 Müller.   *Ei, eis*, and also *eidem* at Plautus, Mil. 758,
as well as Juvenal's *eisdem*, are easily explained as analogical
restorations.   It has often been stated that *meus* sometimes
made *mi* (nominative and vocative plural) and *mis* in the early
period.[4]   I do not think that the monosyllabic forms are ever

---

[1] He is followed by Brugmann IF. VI 87 f., and Grundriss I² 184, 318, 800, and
by Sommer, Handbuch der lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre 87.

[2] He is followed apparently by Stolz, Müller's Handbuch II³ 2, 33.

[3] Of course a form **mẹ̄ẹ̄s* never existed; for in **meios* the *i* was not protected by
a following consonant as in **deiuos*.   Forms **ẹ̄, *ĕs, *mẹ̄, *mẹ̄ẹ̄s* must have existed at
one time.

[4] For example, Neue-Wagener, Formenlehre II³ 366 ff.; Bücheler-Windekilde,
Grundriss der lateinischen Deklination, 129; Georges, Lexicon der lateinischen
Wortformen s. v.; Thurneysen, Kuhn's Zeitschrift XXX 500; Sommer, Handbuch
der lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre 446.

required by the meter of the poets.[1]   But, as already pointed
out (p. 8), we must read *mieis* Corpus I 38 = VI 1292 (after
a. u. c. 615) as a monosyllable.   *Mieis* of the Ambrosian
Palimpsest at Men. 202 must date from the sixth or seventh
century of the city and was probably employed by some scribe
to indicate the monosyllabic pronunciation.   The same may be
said of the *mieis* (rather than *miis*) which Velius Longus
(p. 77 Keil) read at Terence, Heaut. 699.[2]   Other *eo-* stems
almost always show the analogical re-formations.   But in
abiegnieis and *aesculmieis* Corpus I 577 *iei* probably stands
for *ī*.

Summary.

At some time after the diphthong *oį* in unaccented syllables
had become *ē̦* and before the beginning of Plautus's literary
activity the groups *ē̦ē̦* and *ĕ̦ē̦* were contracted into *ē̦*.   And so we
have from *deus*, *dē̦* and *dē̦s;* from *is*, *ē̦* and *ĕ̦s*. The change of
ē̦ to *ī*, about 600 a. u. c., yielded the familiar *dī*, *dīs*, etc.   The
analogical re-formations *deī* and *deīs* did not appear until the
time of Catullus.   They were peculiar to the literary language
and never became universal even there.   The corresponding
re-formations of the pronoun were earlier and more widespread.
Plautus ordinarily employed *eē̦* and *eē̦s*, and once at least he
used *eē̦dem*.   Later on the monosyllabic *ī* and *īs* were decidedly
more frequent, while *īdem* and *īsdem* were almost the only
forms in use.

The spellings *iei* = *ī* in the early period and *ii* = *ī* at a later
time originated with the *įo-* and *įā-* stems, where both *iei* and
ii, on the one hand, and *ei* and *i*, on the other, stood originally
for actual pronunciations.   The writings spread, however, to
other words and became especially common in our monosylla-
bles.   *Dii*, *diis*, *ii*, and *iis* were the favorite spellings of the
Roman grammarians.

---

[1] The often quoted line, Plautus, Cist. 678, may be read as follows (anapaestic):

   Mei hominĕs, *mei* spectatóres, facite indícium, siquis vídet.

[2] And yet *mieis* is a dissyllable at Bücheler, Carm. Epigraph. 1532 (senarius):

   Cara *mieis* vixi, virgo vitam reddidi.

LIFE

I was born at Jacksonville, Ill., in 1875, the son of Alfred Henry Sturtevant and Harriet Morse Sturtevant, both of whom still live. After completing my primary education I attended the Whipple Academy in Jacksonville for three years. For two years I was a student at Illinois College in Jacksonville, and for three years at Indiana University in Bloomington. I received the degree of Bachelor of Arts from the latter institution in 1898. The subsequent three years were spent in study at the University of Chicago.

I desire to express my deep gratitude to my teachers: Doctor Joseph R. Harker, formerly of Whipple Academy, Professor Milton E. Churchill of Illinois College, Mrs. Charles Henry Beeson, formerly of Indiana University, Professor Horace Addison Hoffman and Professor Harold Whetstone Johnston of Indiana University, Doctor John Jacob Meyer of the University of Chicago, Doctor Alfred Stratton, formerly of the University of Chicago, Professor William Gardner Hale of the University of Chicago. To Professor Frank Frost Abbott and especially to Professor Carl Darling Buck of the University of Chicago I am indebted not only for instruction, but also for their careful criticism of the accompanying paper. The paper was suggested by Professor Buck and to him it owes much of whatever merit it may possess.

Departments

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY
Under the supervision of the editors of the *Intercollegiate Classical Series*

ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE
Under the supervision of the editor of the *Lake English Classics*

GERMANIC PHILOLOGY
Under the supervision of the editor of the *Lake German Series*

ROMANCE
Under the supervision of the editor of the *Lake French Series*

PHYSICAL SCIENCES
Under the supervision of the editor of the *Lake Science Series*

Prospectus

We desire to call the attention of universities, libraries, and the learned public to this Series of representative Doctoral Theses, which it is proposed eventually to extend so as to embrace the various fields of research cultivated in all the larger American universities. Only such theses will be taken into the Series as are especially recommended to our editorial staff by the professors in charge of the departments of the universities at which they have been presented for the degree. Each department of the Series will be under the immediate supervision of the editors of our several series of educational text-books. With this twofold control it is believed that the DISSERTATIONES AMERICANAE will maintain a high standard of excellence and will prove a valuable repository of the best scientific product of our younger scholars.

Each monograph will be published separately, but for the convenience of libraries the monographs in each department will be bound together in volumes with continuous pagination. The publications will be put upon the market in the usual way, and, through our foreign agents, will be catalogued in all the bibliographies of current scientific literature, and sent to the leading departmental journals for review.

SCOTT, FORESMAN AND COMPANY
CHICAGO